

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Carl W. Hoffman, (ECF No. 38), which states that Plaintiff Karen E. Rea's Motion for Reversal or Remand, (ECF No. 23), should be denied and Defendant Carolyn W. Colvin's Motion to Affirm, (ECF No. 32), should be granted.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

Page 1 of 2

1           **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 38) is  
2 **ACCEPTED AND ADOPTED in full.**

3           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Reversal or Remand (ECF  
4 No. 23) is **DENIED.**

5           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Affirm (ECF No. 32) is  
6 **GRANTED.** The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly and close the case.

7           **DATED** this 12th day of November, 2014.

8  
9   
10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge  
12 United States District Court  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25